

FEB 14 1967
No.

20436

In the

United States Court of Appeals
For the Ninth Circuit

D. J. MILLER,)
Appellant,)
-vs-)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, a Political)
Subdivision of the State of Cali-)
fornia,)
Appellee.)

APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENT
TO HIS REPLY BRIEF

FILED
FEB 14 1967
M. E. LUCAS - CLERK
D. J. MILLER
Post Office Box 728
Boulder City, Nevada
Propria persona

No.

In the

United States Court of Appeals
For the Ninth Circuit

D. J. MILLER,)
Appellant,)
-vs-)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, a Political)
Subdivision of the State of Cali-)
fornia,)
Appellee.)

)

NOTICE OF MOTION;
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT
APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF

Appellant moves the Court for leave to file a short supplement to his Reply Brief on the following grounds:

Appellant was anxious to comply with the rules of the Court and file his Reply Brief in time, which he did; however, certain further, distinguishing points are evident from a perusal of "Appellee's Brief" in Howard v. State of California,

- b -

216 Cal. App. 2d 281, the case that appellee mistakenly avers to be "identical with the one at bar." Also, on the point of "property statement", from the County of Orange, appellee's neighbor, further corroborating information, received after said Reply Brief was delivered to the printer, is cited. Submitted without oral argument.

Respectfully submitted,

D. J. MILLER,
Appellant, pro se

No.

In the

United States Court of Appeals

For the Ninth Circuit

D. J. MILLER,)
Appellant,)
-vs-)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, a Political)
Subdivision of the State of Cali-)
fornia,)
Appellee.)

APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENT
TO HIS REPLY BRIEF

A letter addressed to appellant herein from the County of Orange, office of the assessor, dated January 24th, 1966, signed by Elmer G. Zimmer states in pertinent part:

"Furthermore, there would never be a necessity for filing a property statement on unimproved, raw acreage." (Emphasis supplied)

